

Interview Summary	Application No. 10/656,698	Applicant(s) TANAKA, YOSHIAKI	
	Examiner Anatoly Vortman	Art Unit 2835	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Examiner Anatoly Vortman / AU 2835. (3) _____.

(2) Sandra M. Katz, Reg. No. 51,864. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 07 February 2006.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 7, 11 and 19.

Identification of prior art discussed: none.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

**ANATOLY VORTMAN
PRIMARY EXAMINER**



Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Applicant's representative has pointed out that claims have been indicated as containing allowable subject matter in the first no-final Office action, and therefore, should not contain "surface tension" limitations, which have been added later in the Amendment filed on 08/18/05.

The Examiner has directed the Applicant's attention to paragraph 7 of the final Office action, which explicitly states that claims would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including ALL of the limitations of the base and intervening claims. However, the Examiner has suggested to consider the Applicant's position if written response from the Applicant would follow.



**ANATOLY VORTMAN
PRIMARY EXAMINER**